



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This suggests to us another argument worthy of our notice. The canon law of the Church of Rome itself, for a thousand years, directs that *every bishop should be chosen in his own province*, and does not give the Pope any right of appointing bishops.

Our next witness is one above all objection. He is Peter Talbot, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin not 200 years ago—a predecessor of the late respected Dr. Murray.

The point we bring him forward to prove is not exactly the same which the last witnesses spoke to, but it is one which completes the subject. Mr. O'Halloran and Dr. O'Connor say, that the Pope did not appoint Bishops in Ireland up to the twelfth century. Archbishop Talbot undertakes to prove that the Pope did not make *Archbishops* in Ireland before that time.

The occasion of Archbishop Talbot writing was this—he claimed the primacy of all Ireland for himself as Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Oliver Plunket, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, wrote a book to prove that, as successor of St. Patrick, he was Primate of Ireland. Archbishop Talbot then wrote his book, called "*Primatus Dubliniensis*," to support the claim of Dublin to the Primacy, which was published in 1674.

He begins by saying, "Primacy can be nothing else than ecclesiastical jurisdiction, greater than that of an archbishop, conferred upon the prelate of any See or state by the Supreme Pontiff. . . . But that jurisdiction cannot be conferred otherwise than by giving the pall of that order." (N.B.—The pall is a woollen garment made at Rome with some curious ceremonies; and the giving of it by the Pope is supposed to confer the authority of archbishop or primate.)

Having laid down this principle, which Roman Catholics cannot deny (though Protestants do deny it, on the ground that archbishops and primates were not made by the Pope at all in the early Church), Archbishop Talbot goes on to apply it (p. 10)†—"It appears, from St. Bernard, that the pall and primacy of St. Patrick was fabulous . . . for he says, in his *Life of St. Malachy*, that to the See of Armagh *the use of the pall, which is the fulness of honour, was yet wanting, and had been wanting from the beginning. And it seemed good in his eyes (Malachy's), if the Church for which he had laboured so much (Armagh, of which he was Archbishop), which hitherto had it not, should acquire it by his zeal and labour. And in section 16, he bore it sufficiently ill, that Ireland should, even as yet, be without the pall. What, I beseech you, is the use of the pall, what the fulness of honour unless it be the jurisdiction of an Archbishop and the dignity of Primate? This was wanting from the beginning to the See of Armagh, and to all Ireland, as appears from the words of D. Bernard.*"‡

This does not prove to Protestants that St. Patrick was not Archbishop and Primate of Ireland; because Protestants are content to follow the early Church, which had archbishops and primates, not made by the Bishop of Rome. But to Roman Catholics, who hold that no man can be a lawful archbishop or primate unless the Pope make him such by giving him the pall, the proof is conclusive that, on their principles, neither St. Patrick nor any of his successors, until 1152, were Archbishops of Armagh or Primate of Ireland. And it proves (what is our concern at present), by the testimony of St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, and of St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, both of whom lived at the very time, that, up to the year 1152, the Pope had never made an Archbishop or Primate of Ireland.

In page 17, Archbishop Talbot says—"St. Patrick himself never was Primate, nor even an Archbishop, since he had not the pall."§

In page 41 he says—"I have consulted what authors I could, and I have considered the annals treating of that matter, and I here seriously declare, that I have fallen upon no author, worthy of credit, who produces even a probable conjecture, that ever, at any time, the See of Armagh obtained the Primacy of Ireland from the Apostolic See."

Archbishop Talbot having thus settled the claim of Armagh to the Primacy, goes on to establish the claim of Dublin, in page 26—

"It remains that we should prove that the Dublin

pall was given by the Roman Pontiff to the city of Dublin, for this reason: because it was the chief or principal city, and the head of the kingdom of Ireland; and at that time, too, when a pall had never before existed in Ireland."* And, then, he brings forward the pall given to Dublin at the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152!

Is it not enough to make an Irishman's blood boil in him to hear this Irishman, Peter Talbot, of an old, and honourable, and patriotic family in Ireland, this Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, deliberately maintaining that Ireland, the Island of Saints, never had an archbishop or primate until the year 1152? and that neither St. Patrick himself, nor any of his successors, ever was a lawful primate, or even an archbishop—simply because the Pope had never made him such—which is, indeed, true.

Yet this is what all Roman Catholics must now say, unless their pride in the ancient independence of Ireland be greater than their love of subjection to Rome.

This book of Archbishop Talbot's has been carefully suppressed of late years. A copy, in Marsh's Library, about twenty-five years ago, was supposed to be the only one in existence. It was stolen out of that library in the year 1828†

But where is the use of suppressing the book while its principles are maintained? Let Roman Catholics only avow that St. Patrick was, indeed, a lawful primate and archbishop of Ireland, by the laws of the ancient Church—*although he was not created by the Pope*—and then they may repudiate this book. But if they persist in making everything depend upon Rome, then they must repudiate St. Patrick as an archbishop, just as their own Archbishop Talbot did.

We have proved our first point—that no bishops nor archbishops in Ireland were made by the Pope up to the year 1152. We shall go on with the next period in our next number.

ANCIENT DIGNITY OF IRELAND.

The following history (which we take from the Appendix to the General Council of Constance)‡ will be interesting to Irishmen, as showing the respect which was paid to the ancient dignity of Ireland.

We must explain, that there was an ancient custom in those councils, of voting by "Nations," as it was called. Four "Nations" were acknowledged—viz., France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. These "Nations" were not "Kingdoms." Each was a collection of several independent kingdoms. We have the lists; and we find that each "Nation" comprised six or eight kingdoms, whose governments were independent of each other.

At the Council of Constance, which was held A.D. 1414, the King of England claimed that the English should be acknowledged as a separate "Nation," having a vote of their own in the Council. The King of France was very jealous at this, and ordered his ambassadors to protest against it in the Council: their protest is given in the appendix of the Council to which we have referred. The ambassadors of France insist, that England had always been reckoned part of the German "Nation" in all general councils; and they maintain that it ought to be so still; for, as England had only twenty-five bishops, it was absurd that so few should have a separate vote in the Council.

The ambassadors of the English King were heard in reply, and they do not deny either of the above statements: but they say, in answer to the fewness of their bishops, that the Irish, who had sixty dioceses, were united with them in the "Anglican Nation," and taking in the Welsh, and some Scotch bishops, who joined with them, there were 110 bishops altogether. And in answer to the statement, that England had always been counted part of the German nation, and not a nation in itself, they do not deny it: on the contrary, they seem to admit that this was true; but then they quote St. Albert the Great and Bartholomæus as follows—"That the whole world being divided into three parts—viz., Asia, Africa, and Europe—Europe is divided into four kingdoms—first, the Roman; secondly, the Constantinopolitan; third, the kingdom of Ireland, which is now translated to the English; and fourth, the kingdom of Spain. From which it appears, that the King of England and his kingdom are of the most eminent and the most ancient kings and kingdoms of all Europe, which prerogative the kingdom of France cannot obtain."

Such was the defence of the ambassadors of England. They did not rest their claim upon the rights of England itself, but on her inheriting the ancient rights of Ireland; and thus England obtained dignity in Europe and influence in Christendom, by her union with Ireland. For this defence having been heard by the Coun-

cil of Constance, they decided that England and Ireland united should rank and vote as a separate nation, thus giving them an influence in the Council which the King of France sought to prevent, and which would have been wholly lost if England had stood alone. We observe, as an appropriate acknowledgment of their obligation to Ireland, that the "Anglican Nation" was throughout represented at that Council by "Patrick, Bishop of Cork."

The rank assigned to Ireland among the kingdoms of Europe, in the above extract, may not appear so absurd if we reflect, that all the other kingdoms of modern Europe, which have any antiquity, arose out of the ruins of the Roman Empire, and can trace their origin no farther back than its decay; while Ireland, which had never been conquered by the Romans, could show the succession of her kingdom for ages before. This was, no doubt, the reason of the precedence assigned to her by St. Albert and Bartholomæus.

In the preface to Lynch's *Feudal Dignities* it is stated (p. 8), that the French rolls in the Tower contain enrolments of the proceedings, on behalf of England, at the Council of Constance.

Correspondence.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

WE have received the following communication, bearing the Ennisworthy post-mark. We thank our correspondent for it, and we print it with pleasure, conceiving it to be very deserving of a place in our pages. (Of course, we think it also our duty, when inserting such communications, to make such observations as seem to us useful. Our correspondent will, we are sure, take this in good part; his object is evidently to promote fair and profitable discussion, and we give his communication *verbatim* :—

"15th February, 1852.

"SIR—I furnish you with the result of my reading, consequent on my receiving THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and earnestly hope my extracts may be useful to your end.—I am in charity, yours,

"A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"When instituting this sacrament, our Lord himself, said—'This is my body'—The bread I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.—John vi. 52. 'Unless you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall have not life in you.'—John vi. 54. You say, perhaps, this bread is no other than what is used for common food. Before consecration it is indeed bread; but no sooner are the words of consecration pronounced, than from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ.—St. Ambrose, lib. 4, de sacr. c. 4, et c. 5.

"Whatever the Lord pleased, he hath done in heaven and on earth.—Psa. cxxxiv. 6. Although the species of bread and wine are visible, yet faith tells us that, after consecration, the body and blood of Christ are alone there.—St. Ambrose de consec., dist. 2, c. omnia.

"Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle; he is not diminished by being given to many, but gives himself whole and entire to each.—St. Augustine, de consec. dist. 2, c. singulis.

"Take and divide it amongst you.—Luke xxii. 17. You see how efficacious are the words of Christ; if, then, the word of the Lord Jesus is so powerful as to summon creation into existence, shall it not require a less exercise of power to make that subsist which already has existence, and to change it into another thing?—St. Ambrose, l. 4, de sacr. c. 4.

"This change mocks the powers of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation. The change itself is the object, not of our comprehension, but of our humble faith; and the manner of that change forbids the temerity of a too curious inquiry.—Eccl. iii. 22. 'No word shall be impossible to God.'—Luke i. 37."

Our brother layman does not seem to disclaim the doctrine of transubstantiation, as stated in the article in our second number, to which he refers, and to which we now beg our readers to look back. He rather seems to admit it, and to justify it. We might prefer that he should have disclaimed the doctrine as there stated; yet we feel that the course which he has taken is one entitled to respectful consideration, because he appeals to the Scripture and to the early Fathers; and it is our sincere desire to discuss such arguments in a reverent and candid spirit.

Our correspondent quotes his Scripture proofs from the Douay Bible, at which we do not complain. He seems to use not the modern edition, which is approved by the present Roman Catholic bishops, but the first edition, published in 1582, or some other, which does not contain the modern alterations. We make no objection to this; only we beg of him to observe, that most of the notes in the early editions have been very properly omitted in that now in use.

Our correspondent seems to think that *all* the words which he quotes from St. John's Gospel were spoken by

* Primatus nihil aliud sit, quam Ecclesiastica jurisdictio, Archiepiscopali major, a summo Pontifice concessa. Præsul alioquin sedis ac civitatis . . . Ea vero jurisdictio non aliter quam per ejus modi collationem Pallii concederetur."

† "Constat ex D. Bernardo, Pallium ac Primatum Patricianum esse chimæricum. . . . Alii enim in vita Sancti Malachie (s. 10) quod sedi armachano deerat adhuc, et deferat ab initio Pallii usus, quod est plenitudo honoris; et etiam est bonum in oculis ejus (Malachie) si Ecclesia pro qua tantum laboraverat, quæ hactenus non habuerat, suo nequireret studio et labore, et c. 16. *Agere satis ferebat, Hiberniam usque adhuc pallio caruisse. Quid quæso Pallii usus? Quid Plenitudo honoris? Nisi jurisdictio Archiepiscopalis, dignitasve Primatialis. Hæc defuit ab initio, sedi Armachanæ, totique Hiberniæ, ut pæ et ex verbis D. Bernardi.*"

‡ D. Bernard is the St. Bernard called by Roman Catholics "the last of the Fathers." He lived at the very time when the Pope first gave the pall to the Irish Archbishops, A.D. 1152. The words in italics are Talbot's quotation from St. Bernard; the rest is Talbot's own.

§ Primas ipsemet St. Patricium nunquam fuisse, imo nec Archiepiscopum cum Pallio caruisse.

¶ Consulit quos potuit auctores ac ea de re tractantes annales revolvit; et tamen post exactissimum scrutinium, serio hic modo testor, me in nullum incidisse auctorem fide dignum, qui vel probabiliter conjecturam afferat, quod ullo unquam tempore sedis Armachanæ Primatum Hiberniæ a sede Apostolica obtinuerit."

* "Reliquum est ut demonstremus Pallium Dubliniense concessum fuisse a Romano Pontifice civitati Dubliniensi, eo quod hæc fuerit prima vel præcipua civitas; capique Regni Hiberniæ. Et quidem tunc temporis cum nunquam antea in Hibernia Pallium existerit."

† A copy (not placed in the catalogue) has been lately found in a press, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The managers of that library will do well to have it in safe keeping; there is no copy in the British Museum. One copy more is in private hands, from which our extracts are taken.

‡ Labbe and Cossart Concilia, vol. xii., col. 1727, et sequen. Ed. Paris, 1672.

our Saviour "when instituting this sacrament." If he will examine this more closely, he will see that, of the three passages he has quoted, these words only, "this is my body," were spoken at the institution; all the rest were spoken on another occasion, at least a year before the sacrament was instituted. It is, therefore, a question whether these words were spoken of the institution, since they were certainly not spoken at it. Now, it is well known that the Fathers differed about this; and the Council of Trent admits that they differed, for the Council says (Session 21, ch. 1)—"Neither from that discourse, in the sixth of John, is it rightly gathered that the partaking of both kinds (bread and wine) was commanded by the Lord; however, it (the discourse) may be understood according to the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and doctors." So the case stands thus: the Fathers differed about whether this discourse was spoken of the institution: we have not, therefore, "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" to interpret this Scripture. The Council of Trent and the Pope could not say which opinion was right; we have, therefore, no guidance here from the infallible judge; and so Roman Catholics and Protestants must form their opinion alike from private judgment on this question, or else they can have no opinion about it at all. We suggest to our friend this way of forming an opinion—Our Saviour said, "If ANY MAN eat of this bread HE shall live for ever." Now, our correspondent will admit that this is NOT true of the consecrated bread in the sacrament. Judas ate of that bread, and perished for ever; many a wicked man eats of it, and perishes for ever; but our Saviour's words ARE true of himself as the bread of life. Therefore, we apply his words to that of which they are true, and not to that of which they are not true; we think that he spoke not of that bread blessed in the sacrament, but that spiritual nourishment which Christ gives to those who faithfully use that sacrament which he has appointed for them.

Our correspondent also quotes from the early Fathers, in support of that view of transubstantiation which we invited Roman Catholics to disclaim. We treat such an argument with respect, though we do not submit to it as infallible; nor do we suppose he produces it as such; for we are sure any person of learning and candour must admit, that many errors might be supported by quotations from Fathers. Still, we give the argument a respectful consideration.

The first step in such an examination is, to inquire carefully whether the Fathers did really say what is attributed to them. We do not, for a moment, suppose that our correspondent would willingly put forward anything, as coming from Augustine or Ambrose, which he knew was not really theirs: but experience has taught us the necessity of such an inquiry; and we think he will see it himself in a new light after hearing what we have to say.

Three of his quotations, out of five, are from St. Ambrose. Now, Du Pin, a French Roman Catholic divine, whose learning rendered him one of the best judges that ever lived of such a question as this, says, in his account of ecclesiastical writers (vol. i., fourth century, St. Ambrose)—"The works of St. Ambrose, above all the other Fathers, have been most corrupted in the ordinary editions. The Roman edition, from which those that followed after were made, instead of restoring the text of this Father, hath rendered it more faulty in many places, by the liberty which the supervisors of that edition took, of making alterations in it by their own authority." In quoting St. Ambrose we should, therefore, be very careful to use the best edition, which is that made by the learned Benedictine monks.

Our correspondent, however, has quoted St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, from the Decretum of Gratian. We do not wonder at this: it was most natural for him to do so. A commission of cardinals and others was appointed, by Pope Gregory XIII., to correct the Decretum; and the Pope confirmed the book so corrected by a Bull (A.D. 1580), and made it an integral part of the Roman Canon Law. No wonder that it should be regarded as a book of high authority, on which we might safely rely. Yet it is confessed, by learned men in the Church of Rome, that Gratian was most careless and incompetent in giving the real authors of the passages he quotes. Not only this, but he quotes numberless passages from letters said to have been written by early Popes, which letters are gross forgeries. Nearly all Gratian's authorities for the supremacy of the Pope (for instance) are taken from these forgeries: and the cardinals who corrected, and the Pope who confirmed the book, took no notice of this; yet it is now admitted, to the fullest extent, by every Roman Catholic writer on the subject. It is evident, therefore, that quotations from the Decretum cannot be admitted as coming from the Fathers to whom Gratian attributes them, without some further inquiry.

Our correspondent's first quotation is taken from the Decretum (*De Consecr.*, Dist. 2, c. 55), where Gratian professes to take it from St. Ambrose, and refers to the book *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv., c. 4 and 5. The latest and best edition of the Canon Law, by Richter, published at Leipsic, 1839, 4to, has a brief and forcible note on this quotation—"Non est Ambrosii"—"It is none of Ambrose's." The learned Benedictine editors give a

candid examination of the evidence whether this book were written by Ambrose, and decide it in the negative; among other reasons, because Ambrose never wrote in so mean a style, nor ever used the cold and childish interrogations of which the book is full. (See Du Pin, as before referred to.) There can be no doubt that this passage was written by some obscure person in the eighth or ninth century, and that Gratian mistook it for St. Ambrose's.

The second passage which our correspondent quotes is to be found *De Consecr.*, Dist. 2, c. 74. It is taken from the same book, on the sacraments, which St. Ambrose did not write; at least Richter says in his note that there are "things like it" in that book, for it would seem he could not find the passage itself even there. The learned Berhard, whose book on the Decretum we shall notice presently, says—"Canon 74 is not found in Ambrose, although it is praised by Gratian, under the name of Ambrose."—Vol. iv., p. 108. Our correspondent gives it thus—"Although the species of bread and wine are visible," &c. We think our correspondent has made a mistake in transcribing here; the Latin word is "figura," not "species." We have looked in the splendid original edition of Eggesteyn, Argent, 1471; in the small Paris edition of 1538; in the Roman edition, corrected by the cardinals and approved by the Pope; and in Richter; and in all the word is "figura." If any edition had "species," Richter would notice it, which he does not. The word makes a great difference: *species* might mean that there was only the appearance, not the reality of bread; but "figura," means that the bread is a figure of Christ's body, not the body itself; and so the passage means, that when we see this figure, we are to take hold of the thing itself by faith, which is Protestant doctrine.

The third passage which our correspondent quotes he attributes to St. Augustine: we do not know on what authority. In the place of the Decretum which he refers to, it is attributed to St. Jerome in all the editions mentioned above. But no such passage has ever been found in any of St. Jerome's works. The cardinals appointed by the Pope to correct the Decretum, say that they found it in a Missal which they attribute not to St. Augustine, but to St. Ambrose. But all who understand such matters, know how impossible it is to attribute a Missal to any individual with certainty. The learned Berhard, in his most valuable work, "In Canones Gratiani," vol. iv., p. 115 (Venice, 1777), says—"It is rather to be referred to a certain Missal;" and this is all that can be said of it with truth. We do not altogether agree in our correspondent's translation here: he says—"Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle;" the Latin is—"Singuli accipiunt Christum Dominum et in singulis portionibus totus est," &c.—"Each receive Christ the Lord, and he is whole in each portion." We see nothing in the Latin to make us apply this to the particles of the bread, but to the portion of Christ which each receives at the sacrament. All receive Christ equally and wholly.

The next passage quoted by our correspondent, and attributed to St. Ambrose, is from the same place in the Decretum (c. 55), and the same place in the book, *De Sacramentis*, from which his first was taken, of which we have already spoken.

Therefore it appears that none of these quotations are the genuine writings of the persons whose names they bear. All are the opinions of obscure writers in much later ages, which have been mistaken for the writing of the Fathers, but which are really of no weight at all.

We have been particular in our examination of these passages, because we think that much mischief has been done in this controversy for want of such attention. The Fathers have not had fair play, when the works of obscure and mean writers have been allowed to pass under their names. The light which the genuine writings of the early Fathers can throw upon such questions has thus been greatly obscured, and controversy has been made more dark, instead of more clear. We thought it our duty to take this opportunity of pointing out such an evil; but we do it with the greatest respect to our correspondent, feeling that he had great apparent reason to rely on the Decretum as he did, and that his letter affords a truly important subject for discussion. We shall be happy to hear from him again, and, in the meantime, we trust he will reconsider our notice of transubstantiation in our last number, and inquire whether Roman Catholics are really willing to admit it, as there stated.

ON CONCOMITANCY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As you say "We invite Roman Catholics to come forward and disclaim whatever they think is unjustly charged on their religion, and place our pages at their disposal for the purpose," I beg to stand forward, in the name of thousands of Roman Catholics in Ireland, and deny boldly and explicitly the doctrine of transubstantiation as explained in your last number.

1st. Roman Catholics do not believe that the consecrated bread is changed into the blood of Christ, but they do believe that it is changed into his body, and that, by concomitancy, where the body is the blood

must be also. As there was nothing before consecration but bread, which cannot be transubstantiated into blood, the blood of Christ must, of course, come down from heaven to accompany the body on the altar into which the bread has been transubstantiated. Protestants will ridicule this doctrine of concomitancy, and profanely ask—"Does the body come down from the right hand of God along with the blood, or does the blood leave the body above, that it may accompany the body below?" Such questions all true Roman Catholics are not careful to answer. They merely wish to deny that there is any necessity for the divine body of Christ to come down from above, as the bread on the altar is really changed into that very body which sits at the right hand of God; but they acknowledge that there is a necessity for the blood to come down, in order to fulfil the law of concomitancy, and therefore they humbly, faithfully, and piously believe that it does so come down, notwithstanding the profane objections of the adversaries. Protestants will again absurdly and impiously inquire—"When the blood leaves the Divine body in heaven, to unite himself with the body on the altar, into which the bread has been transubstantiated, does it leave that heavenly body bloodless above?" Again, permit me to say, no true and faithful Roman Catholic is anxious to satisfy such inquiries. I may, however, observe, that there is nothing absurd, but rather according to true doctrine in the belief that, although the whole blood must leave the body above to unite itself to the body on the altar, yet the whole blood still remains in the body above by the same law of concomitancy. If you will prove yourself so impartial as to insert the above, I may, perhaps, continue my observations in a following number.

And am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

CATHOLICUS.

It is for Roman Catholics, not for us, to say whether the above answer will satisfy them. It does not satisfy us.

At the same time we beg to say that we do not "ridicule" the doctrine of "concomitancy," neither do we "profanely ask" the questions which our correspondent attributes to Protestants. We do not "ridicule" any doctrine of the Roman Catholic faith, nor do we assume that any doctrine must be false because our reason does not comprehend how it can be true. But we do bring all doctrines to the test of Divine revelation, and ask whether God has revealed them; if he have, we accept them with faith.

The doctrine of "concomitancy" is thus stated by the Council of Trent—"Sed Corpus quidem sub specie panis, et sanguinem sub vini specie, ex vi verborum, ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connectionis et concomitantiae, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit non amplius moriturus, inter se copulantur," &c.

"The body of Christ, indeed (exists) under the appearance of bread, and the blood under the appearance of wine, from the power of the words, but the body itself (exists) under the appearance of wine, and the blood under the appearance of bread, and the soul under either, by the power of that natural connection and concomitancy, by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has now risen from the dead to die no more, are connected among themselves," &c.—Sess. xii., c. 3.

However this doctrine may favour transubstantiation, and receiving in one kind only, it seems to us fatal to the Mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin; for, according to this doctrine, the blood is not shed from the body, and cannot be, and yet the Scripture says—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission."—Hebrews ix., v. 22, Douay Bible. When Christ died on the cross his blood was shed, and this was the sacrifice for the remission of sin. If his blood cannot be separated from his body in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and this doctrine of "concomitancy" affirms that it cannot, then, according to the Revelation of God, the Mass cannot be a sacrifice for "remission," for "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

READING THE SCRIPTURES.

We also freely insert the following letter of Mr. Aylmer, which reached us a few days since. It will afford us an opportunity hereafter of explaining our own views more fully, when discussing those of our correspondent. He will not find that we contend for any such absurdities as that of making a child the arbiter of the most important truths; nor shall we contend either that there are no difficulties in the Holy Scriptures, or that they may not be misinterpreted. We know they must have been misinterpreted by Churches as well as children, or men could not so differ about them. To consider the subject as fully as its grave importance deserves, would much exceed the space at our command in our present number; but we hope to recur speedily to both the letter and the pamphlet of our respected correspondent; in the meantime merely expressing our gratification at the frank and independent tone of his communication, as well as the spirit in which it is conceived. Collecting, as we do, from his pamphlet